

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**In re: JUUL Labs, Inc., Marketing, Sales
Practices, and Products Liability
Litigation**

Case No. [19-md-02913-WHO](#)

**ORDER REGARDING CLAIMS RIPE
FOR DISMISSAL AGAINST ALTRIA**

Re: Dkt. No. 4342

Having reviewed Altria's Supplemental Notice of Claims Ripe for Dismissal with Prejudice (Dkt. No. 4342), the following claims are DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE against all Altria-related entities: all claims identified on Exhibits A, B, C, E, F, G & H of Dkt. No. 4342.

The Clerk's Office shall dismiss the Altria entities and close these cases.

The Clerk's Office shall also recategorize the following cases. These cases are not part of this MDL, but instead are related to and should be consolidated with 20-2345 *In re In re Juul Labs, Inc. Antitrust Litigation: Deadwyler v. Altria Group, Inc. et al.*, 3:20-cv-02729; *Walsh, et al. v. Altria Group Inc. et al.*, 3:20-cv-03183; and *McGee v. Juul Labs Inc. et al.*, 3:20-cv-04413.

The Clerk's Office shall consolidate these cases with 20-2345 and close these cases in the MDL.


With respect to the twelve cases identified in Exhibit D, Altria asks me to dismiss the claims of the plaintiffs because the Personal Injury Settlement Administrator "could not verify" that the plaintiffs intended to or could sue the Altria-related entities and the Administrator attempted to communicate with counsel so those plaintiffs could "reconsider" the Settlement Administrator's determination. Dkt. No. 4342 at 4. Review of the complaints filed in those cases indicates that Altria-related entities were sued and many allegations of use expressly cover the period of Altria's potential liability. Accordingly, within ten days of the date of this Order,

1 counsel for Altria shall submit a supplemental notice describing: (1) the steps the Settlement
2 Administrator took to attempt to verify that Altria was *not* “intended” to be sued by these
3 plaintiffs; (2) how that determination was reached; (3) when the Administrator communicated that
4 determination to these plaintiffs; (4) and how long the plaintiffs had to respond/seek
5 “reconsideration.” Once that information is provided, I can determine whether to close these cases
6 for failure to participate in the settlement process.

7 Finally, within ten days of the date of this Order, counsel for JLI and plaintiffs shall inform
8 the court concerning the status of the following cases (where Altria is not a defendant): *Boyd v.*
9 *JUUL Labs, Inc.*, 3:19-cv-06914; *McFaull v. JUUL Labs, Inc. et al.*, 3:19-cv-06923; *Ali v. 7-*
10 *Eleven, Inc.*, 3:22-cv-03240; *Soulas v. JUUL Labs, Inc. et al.* 3:20-cv-01615.

11 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

12 Dated: December 9, 2024

13
14 
15 William H. Orrick
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28